





APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/301,284	04/28/1999	SHUICHI TAKAYAMA	NAK1-BG86	5392
75	90 10/23/2002			
PRICE GESS & UBELL 2100 S E MAIN STREET SUITE 250 IRVINE, CA 92614			EXAMINER	
			VO, TED T	
ikvine, ca 9	2014		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2122	16
			DATE MAILED: 10/23/2002	i ×

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

yen

.,		7M			
•	Applicati n N .	Applicant(s)			
Advisory Action	09/301,284	TAKAYAMA ET AL.			
	Examiner Ted T. Vo	Art Unit			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app		2122			
THE REPLY FILED 25 September 2002 FAILS TO PLATherefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appel Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	ACE THIS APPLICATION IN avoid abandonment of this ap (1) a timely filed amendment eal (with appeal fee); or (3) a	CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.  oplication. A proper reply to a  which places the application in			
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]					
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of this Adevent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later to ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 705.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The draw been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exter 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortene (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three meanned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	Ivisory Action, or (2) the date set forth han SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF ate on which the petition under 37 CFF insign and the corresponding amount of the statutory period for reply originally set.	te of the final rejection.  THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP  R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee If the fee. The appropriate extension fee under			
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.					
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:					
(a) 🛛 they raise new issues that would require furth	ner consideration and/or searc	ch (see NOTE below);			
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);					
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or					
(d) $\square$ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.					
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.					
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection.	ction(s):				
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).					
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:					
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.					
7.☑ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a)☑ will not be entered or b)☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.					
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:					
Claim(s) allowed:					
Claim(s) objected to:					
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-11</u> .					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on is a)☐ approved or b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.					
Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)					
10. Other:					
S. Patent and Trademark Office					

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Continuation of 2. NOTE: The amendment adds new claim limitation to claim 1, "the position of which does not correspond to a byte boundary", would cause further consideration. This new limitation, which is the Negative Limitation that tends to define the invention in terms of what it was not rather than pointing out the invention, is not deemed to place the application in the better form. The new limitation added in the claim 10 and the new claim 49 would cause further consideration or search..

GREGORY MORSE

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINATION
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100